

**TEEN PARENT PROGRAM**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2002**  
**SIX MONTH UPDATE (APRIL 2002 - SEPTEMBER 2002)**

**Data Prepared by**  
**Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation Division**  
**Service Delivery Administration**  
**Michigan Family Independence Agency**

**January 2003**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Michigan Family Independence Agency's (MFIA) on-going evaluation/monitoring of the Teen Parent Program began October 1, 1994. This document represents the second six-month update for FY 01-02 (i.e., April 2002 through September 2002) and is comprised of fifteen tables, highlights of which are presented below.

- During this six-month period, 736 new participants entered the program, with 15.5% of the participants being referred to the program by their local FIA offices.
- In terms of race/ethnicity,
  - 66.4% of the participants were African American.
  - 25.9% of the participants were white.
  - 5.2% of the participants were Hispanic.
  - 0.8% of the participants were Native American.
- Providers have the option of providing services to teen fathers. A number of sites have exercised this option, with males comprising 7.2% of the recent participants.
- The average age of this group of participants was 18.10 years.
- 96.3% of the participants were single.
- 52.2% of the participants were pregnant (or pregnant and parenting) upon entering the program, with 93.9% of those participating in prenatal care at that time.
- 57.9% of the teens were parenting (or pregnant and parenting), with 82.3% of them parenting one child, 15.8% parenting two children, and 1.9% parenting three children.
- On average, the highest grade completed by the teens was 10.2.
- At the time of entering the program (note, duplicate responses were possible: e.g., a person could be identified as being in GED training and school simultaneously),
  - 45.4% of the participants were enrolled in school.
  - 4.3% of the participants were enrolled in GED training.
  - 3.9% of the participants were GED holders.
  - 13.5% of the participants were high school graduates.
- 15.0% of the participants were employed at the time they entered the program, averaging 26 hours of work a week at an average hourly rate of \$6.31.
- 33.0% of the participants were not involved in education **or** employment activities at the time they entered the program.

# TEEN PARENT PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 2002

Six Month Update

April 2002 - September 2002

The Michigan Family Independence Agency's (MFIA) on-going evaluation/monitoring of the Teen Parent Program (TPP) began October 1, 1994. This document represents the second six-month update for FY 01-02. Specifically, the following tables summarize intake information about those individuals who entered the program during the latter **six** months of fiscal year 2002, namely, April 2002 through September 2002.

The program continues to operate via twenty-one sites (21) in eighteen (18) counties. The specific counties being served by the program include Berrien, Calhoun, Chippewa, Clare, Genesee, Ingham, Jackson, Kalamazoo<sup>1</sup>, Kent, Lake, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Ogemaw, Oakland, Saginaw, Van Buren, and Wayne, which is home to four (4) sites.

## PART I: ENTRANCE INTO THE PROGRAM

**Table 1** presents the total number of participants who entered the teen parent program between April 1, 2002, and September 30, 2002. During this six-month period, 736 new participants entered the program.

**Table 1**  
**NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS**

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL <sup>2</sup>	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Number of Participants Entering the Program During the Month	110	122	96	125	140	143	736	1416	1249

<sup>1</sup> The program associated with Kalamazoo County began enrolling participants November 2001.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to these 1,416 new cases in fiscal year 2002, there were 1,017 active carry-over/ongoing cases that were receiving services at the start of the fiscal year (i.e., cases that opened prior to October 1, 2001, and remained open as of the start of FY01-02). Source: Teen Parent Program Semi-Annual Monitoring Report (October 2001).

**Table 2** identifies the sources responsible for referring the participants to the program. Referrals received from the Family Independence Agency (FIA) were to be given top priority. As can be seen, 15.5% (114) of the referrals during this six month period were from the FIA. This was surpassed by referrals from some “other” source (see footnote, below, for details regarding “other” referral sources), which accounted for 36.1% (266) of the referrals. Meanwhile, rounding out the top three referral sources was “school” which accounted for 15.1% (111) of the referrals. The remaining 33.3% of the individuals were referred to the program by such sources as health care provider, public/community health agencies, community agencies, and mental health agencies.

**Table 2**  
**REFERRAL SOURCE**

REFERRAL SOURCE	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
FIA	21	25	7	19	23	19	114 (15.5%)	234 (16.5%)	310 (24.9%)
Health Care Provider	9	6	9	5	12	16	57 (7.7%)	124 (8.8%)	156 (12.5%)
Public/Community Health	8	17	14	22	22	17	100 (13.6%)	166 (11.7%)	135 (10.8%)
Community Agency	24	18	12	10	15	8	87 (11.8%)	196 (13.9%)	144 (11.6%)
Mental Health	0	0	1	0	0	0	1 (0.1%)	3 (0.2%)	4 (0.3%)
School	10	16	11	19	16	39	111 (15.1%)	207 (14.6%)	122 (9.8%)
Other <sup>3</sup>	38	40	42	50	52	44	266 (36.1%)	484 (34.2%)	374 (30.0%)
TOTALS	110	122	96	125	140	143	736 (100.0%) <sup>4</sup>	1414 (100.0%)	1245 (100.0%)
Missing <sup>5</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4

<sup>3</sup> "Other" responses given included the following: self, friend, relative, mother of child/girlfriend (to male participant), another program participant, was a former program participant, neighbor, adoption worker, social worker, the TPP agency, private agency, court system (e.g., probate court, juvenile court), probation officer, church, "All Stars Program", "Healthy Families America", "Healthy Babies/Healthy Start", "Family Links Program", MSU Extension, 211 Non-Emergency number, phone book, flyer, Metro Baby Magazine, shelter, etc.

<sup>4</sup> In this and subsequent tables, total may not equal 100.0% due to rounding error.

<sup>5</sup> Missing, in this and subsequent tables, refers to information that was unavailable at time of reporting.

## PART II: PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

**Table 3** presents the racial/ethnic breakdown of participants entering the program during the latter six months of fiscal year 2002. Accordingly, 66.4% (488) of the individuals were African American, 25.9% (190) were white, 5.2% (38) were Hispanic, and 0.8% (6) were Native American. The “other” responses served to identify thirteen individuals as multi-racial.

**Table 3**  
**RACE/ETHNICITY**

RACE/ETHNICITY	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
White	30	39	21	32	27	41	190 (25.9%)	390 (27.6%)	381 (30.8%)
African American	66	78	70	86	101	87	488 (66.4%)	915 (64.7%)	769 (61.8%)
Native American	1	1	0	1	2	1	6 (0.8%)	14 (1.0%)	9 (0.7%)
Hispanic	7	3	4	6	7	11	38 (5.2%)	67 (4.7%)	58 (4.7%)
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 (0.4%)
Other	5	1	1	0	3	3	13 (1.8%)	28 (2.0%)	22 (1.8%)
TOTALS	109	122	96	125	140	143	735 (100.0%)	1414 (100.0%)	1244 (100.0%)
Missing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5

Providers have the option of providing services to teen fathers. **Table 4** presents the gender breakdown of participants entering the program during the **latter** six months of fiscal year 2002. Accordingly, 92.8% (683) of the individuals were female, and 7.2% (53) were male.

**Table 4**  
**GENDER<sup>6</sup>**

	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 (LATTER 6 MONTHS)
GENDER	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Female	99	113	90	119	126	136	683 (92.8%)	1294 (91.4%)	734 (93.4%)
Male	11	9	6	6	14	7	53 (7.2%)	122 (8.6%)	52 (6.6%)
TOTALS	110	122	96	125	140	143	736 (100.0%)	1416 (100.0%)	786 (100.0%)

---

<sup>6</sup>Information related to gender was first collected in April 2001.

**Table 5** displays the age distribution of participants entering the program during the latter six months of fiscal year 2002, with the overall average age being 18.10 years. For those participants entering the program during the months of April, May and June 2002, age was calculated as of June 30, 2002, with the average age being 18.02 years. Meanwhile, for those who entered during the months of July, August, and September 2002, age was calculated as of September 30, 2002, with the average age being 18.16 years.

**Table 5**  
**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS**

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Twelve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)
Thirteen	1	1	1	1	1	3	8 (1.1%)	11 (0.8%)	8 (0.7%)
Fourteen	4	1	4	1	5	2	17 (2.3%)	39 (2.8%)	31 (2.5%)
Fifteen	5	8	10	6	5	8	42 (5.8%)	100 (7.2%)	85 (7.0%)
Sixteen	12	19	12	25	13	23	104 (14.4%)	204 (14.7%)	195 (16.0%)
Seventeen	24	35	26	22	31	46	184 (25.4%)	323 (23.3%)	312 (25.5%)
Eighteen	26	25	19	19	38	24	151 (20.9%)	287 (20.3%)	286 (23.4%)
Nineteen	25	21	11	24	25	26	132 (20.9%)	242 (17.4%)	201 (16.4%)
Twenty	9	8	9	19	11	8	64 (8.8%)	134 (9.7%)	79 (6.5%)
Twenty-one and over	1	4	4	7	5	1	22 (3.0%)	45 (3.2%)	23 (1.9%)
TOTALS	107	122	96	124	134	141	724 (100.0%)	1387 (100.0%)	1222 (100.0%)
Missing	3	0	0	1	6	2	12	29	27

**Table 6** displays the breakdown of age by gender. The average female participant was 17.95 years old, and the average male participant was 19.64 years old.

**Table 6**  
**AGE BY GENDER<sup>7</sup>**

AGE BY GENDER	LATTERSIX MONTHS - FISCAL YEAR 02				FY02 % TOTAL (N)	FY01 % (latter six months only) (N)
	% 16 Years and Under	% 17 Years	% 18 Years and Over	Totals (N)		
Female	98.2	98.4	89.2	93.6 (678)	92.0 (1276)	93.6 (721)
Male	1.8	1.6	10.8	6.4 (46)	8.0 (111)	6.4 (49)
TOTALS (N)	100.0 (171)	100.0 (184)	100.0 (369)	100.0 (724)	100.0 (1387)	100.0 (770)

---

<sup>7</sup> For the latter six months of FY02, there were twelve cases for which information about age was missing, bringing the YTD total of missing cases to twenty-nine. Meanwhile, for the latter six months of FY01, there were sixteen cases for which information about age was missing.

**Table 7** displays the marital status of the participants. Accordingly, 96.3% (708) were single, 3.4% (25) were married, and one participant (0.1%) was divorced. The “other” response served to identify one participant as “engaged to be married.”

Of the twenty-five individuals who were married, thirteen were white, five were African American, three were Hispanic, and four were multi-racial. In terms of age, one was sixteen years old or younger, five were seventeen years old, and nineteen were eighteen years old or older.

**Table 7**  
**MARITAL STATUS**

MARITAL STATUS	MONTH							FY01 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Single	102	119	92	120	136	139	708 (96.3%)	1361 (96.2%)	1161 (95.1%)
Married	7	3	4	4	3	4	25 (3.4%)	51 (3.6%)	54 (4.4%)
Divorced	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
Other	0	0	0	0	1	0	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	5 (0.4%)
TOTALS	109	122	96	125	140	143	735 (100.0%)	1415 (100.0%)	1221 (100.0%)
Missing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	28

### PART III: PREGNANCY AND PARENTING INFORMATION

**Table 8** reveals the number of participants who were pregnant, parenting, or pregnant and parenting at time of intake. Accordingly, 42.1% (310) were pregnant, 47.8% (352) were parenting, and 10.1% (74) were pregnant and parenting upon entering the program.

**Table 8**  
**PREGNANCY/PARENTING STATUS**

PREGNANCY/PARENTING STATUS AT TIME OF INTAKE	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Pregnant	44	53	40	47	55	71	310 (42.1%)	609 (43.1%)	191 (41.4%)
Parenting	54	57	46	66	72	57	352 (47.8%)	673 (47.9%)	633 (50.8%)
Pregnant and Parenting	12	12	10	12	13	15	74 (10.1%)	132 (9.3%)	106 (8.5%)
TOTALS	110	122	96	125	140	143	736 (100.0%)	1414 (100.0%)	1245 (100.0%)
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4

Meanwhile, of those pregnant upon entering the program, 93.9% were receiving prenatal care at that time, as shown in **Table 8A** below:

**Table 8A**  
**PRENATAL CARE**

IF PARTICIPANT WAS PREGNANT AT TIME OF INTAKE, WAS SHE RECEIVING PRENATAL CARE?	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Yes	50	62	46	50	63	83	354 (93.9%)	698 (95.2%)	563 (94.1%)
No	2	3	4	9	2	3	23 (6.1%)	35 (4.8%)	35 (5.9%)
TOTALS	52	65	50	59	65	86	377 (100.0%)	733 (100.0%)	598 (100.0%)
Missing	4	0	0	0	3	0	7	8	14

in addition, the status of those parenting (or pregnant and parenting) may be further broken down in terms of the number of children they had at time of intake. These data are displayed in tables 8B and 8C. With respect to ages of the children, 72.2% (366) were one year or younger, 17.4% (88) were two years old, 5.5% (28) were three years old, 3.7% (19) were four years old, and 1.2% (6) were five years old or older.

According to **Table 8B**, 81.4% (285) of those parenting had one child, 17.4% (61) had two children, and 1.1% (4) had three children.

**Table 8B**  
**OF THOSE PARENTING, NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

OF THOSE PARENTING AT TIME OF INTAKE, NUMBER OF CHILDREN:	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
One	47	48	40	51	54	45	285 (81.4%)	551 (82.4%)	516 (82.8%)
Two	6	8	6	14	15	12	61 (17.4%)	102 (15.2%)	93 (14.9%)
Three	1	1	0	1	1	0	4 (1.1%)	15 (2.2%)	12 (1.9%)
Four	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.3%)
TOTALS	54	57	46	66	70	57	350 (100.0%)	669 (100.0%)	623 (100.0%)
Missing	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	10

Similarly, **Table 8C** reveals that 86.5% (64) of the individuals who were pregnant and parenting had one child, 8.1% (6) had two children, and 5.4% (4) had three children.

**Table 8C**  
**OF THOSE PREGNANT AND PARENTING, NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

IF PARTICIPANT WAS PREGNANT & PARENTING AT TIME OF INTAKE, NUMBER OF CHILDREN:	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
One	11	11	7	9	13	13	64 (86.5%)	110 (83.3%)	85 (81.0%)
Two	1	1	2	1	0	1	6 (8.1%)	17 (12.9%)	17 (16.2%)
Three	0	0	1	2	0	1	4 (5.4%)	5 (3.8%)	3 (2.9%)
TOTALS	12	12	10	12	13	15	74 (100.0%)	132 (100.0%)	105 (100.0%)
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

## **PART IV: EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS**

**Tables 9 and 10** reveal the participants' educational and employment status at time of intake. Note that, on average, the highest grade completed by the participants upon entering the program was 10.2.

### **A. School**

The 325 individuals (45.4%) enrolled in school may further be described in the following manner:

- Nineteen individuals were enrolled in both school and GED training.
- Two individuals had a GED certificate.
- Twenty-five teens had a high school diploma.
- Forty-three teens were working and going to school.
- On average, the highest grade completed by this group of individuals was 10.0.
- In terms of age, 34.3% were sixteen years old or younger, 32.1% were seventeen years old, and 33.6% were eighteen years old or older.

The 391 individuals (54.6%) who were not enrolled in school may further be described in the following manner:

- Seventy-two teens had a high school diploma.
- Twenty-six participants had a GED certificate.
- Twelve individuals were in GED training.
- Sixty-three teens were employed.
- On average, the highest grade completed by this group of individuals was 10.3.
- In terms of age, 14.2% were sixteen years old or younger, 19.8% were seventeen years old, and 66.0% were eighteen years old or older.

Of the twenty cases for whom information about school enrollment was missing, ten were similarly missing responses to the remaining questions regarding education and employment. Eight cases, while missing information about school enrollment, did indicate negative responses to the remaining questions regarding education and employment. Meanwhile, two cases, while missing information about school enrollment and other educational pursuits, did indicate employment.

### **B. GED Training**

Of the thirty-one individuals in GED training, nineteen were also in school and two were working (including one who was also attending school). In terms of age, 0.3% were sixteen years old or younger, 35.5% were seventeen years old, and 61.3% were eighteen years old or older.

### **C. GED Certificate**

Twenty-eight individuals were identified as having a GED certificate, two of whom were continuing their education and three of whom were working.

### **D. High School Diploma**

The ninety-seven individuals who had a high school diploma may further be described in the following manner:

- Twenty-five teens were continuing their education.
- Twenty-seven teens were working.

The 623 individuals who did not have a high school diploma may further be described in the following manner:

- 300 teens were enrolled in school.
- Thirty-one teens were in GED training (including nineteen who were also identified as being enrolled in school).
- Twenty-eight teens, while lacking a diploma, did have a GED certificate.
- Seventy-nine individuals, who lacked a high school diploma, were working at the time they entered the program.

---

For 243 individuals, or 33.0% of those who entered the program during the latter six months of fiscal year 2002, negative responses were received for each question regarding education **and** employment. In other words, they were neither enrolled in school nor GED training, lacked a GED certificate or high school diploma, and were not employed. In terms of age, 20.6% of these individuals were sixteen years old or younger, 24.7% were seventeen years old, and 54.7% were eighteen years old or older.

---

**Table 9**  
**EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE**

PARTICIPANT'S EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT TIME OF INTAKE	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
A. Was the participant in school at intake?	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Yes	51	52	45	37	57	83	325 (45.4%)	658 (47.4%)	571 (48.0%)
No	53	70	51	88	75	54	391 (54.6%)	729 (52.6%)	619 (52.0%)
TOTALS (Missing)	104 (6)	122	96	125	132 (8)	137 (6)	716 (20) (100.0%)	1387(29) (100.0%)	1190 (59) (100.0%)
B. Was the participant in GED training?	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS	02 TOTAL	01 Total
Yes	4	4	4	4	10	5	31 (4.3%)	65 (4.7%)	72 (6.1%)
No	101	117	92	121	122	133	686 (95.7%)	1324 (95.3%)	1115 (93.9%)
TOTALS (Missing)	105 (5)	122	96	125	132 (8)	138 (5)	717 (19) (100.0%)	1389 (27) (100.0%)	1187 (62) (100.0%)
C. Did the participant have a GED?	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS	02 TOTAL	01 Total
Yes	1	6	3	8	5	5	28 (3.9%)	5729 (4.1%)	38 (3.2%)
No	105	115	93	117	128	134	692 (96.1%)	1335 (95.9%)	1151 (96.8%)
TOTALS (Missing)	106 (4)	121 (1)	96	125	133 (7)	139 (4)	720 (16) (100.0%)	1392 (24) (100.0%)	1189 (60) (100.0%)
D. Did the participant have a hs diploma?	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS	02 TOTAL	01 Total
Yes	14	9	17	22	21	14	97 (13.5%)	191 (13.7%)	147 (12.4%)
No	92	112	79	103	112	125	623 (86.5%)	1201 (86.3%)	1042 (87.6%)
TOTALS (Missing)	106 (4)	121 (1)	96	125	133 (7)	139 (4)	720 (16) (100.0%)	1392 (24) (100.0%)	1189 (60) (100.0%)

**Table 10** indicates the number of participants who were employed at time of intake. Accordingly, 15.0% (108) had a job upon entering the teen parent program, whereas 85.0% (610) of the individuals were unemployed.

**Table 10**  
**EMPLOYMENT STATUS**

WAS THE PARTICIPANT WORKING AT TIME OF INTAKE?	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
Yes	21	20	14	17	19	17	108 (15.0%)	232 (16.7%)	239 (20.2%)
No	82	102	82	108	117	119	610 (85.0%)	1157 (83.3%)	943 (79.8%)
TOTALS	103	122	96	125	131	136	718 (100.0%)	1389 (100.0%)	1182 (100.0%)
Missing	7	0	0	0	4	7	18	27	67

For the 108 teens employed at time of entry into the program, the average weekly hours worked was 26.0 and the average hourly wage was \$6.31. In addition, the average age of those employed was 18.77 years. Furthermore,

- Twenty-seven individuals had a high school diploma (four of whom were also continuing their education).
- Three teens had a GED certificate.
- Two teens were in GED training (one of whom was also identified as enrolled in school).
- Forty-three individuals were in school (one of whom was also in GED training, and three of whom had a diploma).
- Thirty-six teens were working, but were not in school or GED training, nor did they have a diploma or GED.
- Two individuals were missing information about education

The 610 individuals who were not working at time of program entry may further be described in the following manner:

- Of the teens not working, 280 were enrolled in school (including eighteen who were also in GED training, twenty-two who had a high school diploma, and one who had a GED certificate).
- Twenty-nine teens were in GED training (eighteen of whom were also identified as being enrolled in school).
- Sixty-nine individuals had a high school diploma (twenty-two of whom were also continuing their education).
- Twenty-five teens had a GED certificate (one of whom was also identified as continuing her education).

## PART V: LIVING ARRANGEMENT

**Table 11**, on the following page, presents the participants' living arrangements upon entering the program. As indicated, 55.2% of the individuals who entered the program during the latter six months of FY02 resided with their parent(s). This was followed by 10.6% living with other relative(s), and 9.3% living independently. The remaining 24.9% was scattered throughout the remaining available responses.

**Table 12**, on page 19, presents a breakdown of living arrangements in terms of age. For example, 74.1% of those teens aged sixteen years or younger were residing with their parent(s) upon entering the program. Meanwhile, 63.6% of those aged seventeen and 55.2% of those aged eighteen or older were living with their parents.

- All totaled, 93.5% of those teens aged sixteen or younger resided with a parent, legal guardian, other relative, or in formal placement. Similarly, 83.8% of those aged seventeen resided with a parent, legal guardian, other relative, spouse, or in formal placement.
- In Table 11 and Table 12, "other" responses given included living with: friend, god sister, partner (in friend's home), mother-in-law (without husband), ex-boyfriend's mother, supportive housing program, treatment center, unknown living arrangement, etc.

**Table 11**  
**LIVING ARRANGEMENT**

WHAT WAS THE PARTICIPANT'S LIVING ARRANGEMENT AT TIME OF INTAKE?	MONTH							FY02 TOTAL	FY01 TOTAL
	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTALS		
w/Parents	59	72	59	63	68	85	406 (55.2%)	756 (53.7%)	638 (51.9%)
w/Guardian	8	2	4	4	4	3	25 (3.4%)	58 (4.1%)	48 (3.9%)
w/Other relative	9	13	13	11	19	13	78 (10.6%)	156 (11.1%)	176 (14.3%)
w/Partner	6	6	3	12	10	6	43 (5.9%)	102 (7.2%)	73 (5.9%)
w/Spouse	2	1	1	1	2	4	11 (1.5%)	24 (1.7%)	29 (2.4%)
Formal placement	4	1	5	4	8	0	22 (3.0%)	33 (2.3%)	26 (2.1%)
Independently	9	12	5	15	13	14	68 (9.3%)	131 (9.3%)	115 (9.3%)
Homeless	2	1	0	5	6	4	18 (2.4%)	35 (2.5%)	18 (1.5%)
w/Partner (in partner's family's home)	5	5	4	5	5	9	33 (4.5%)	56 (4.0%)	59 (4.8%)
Other	6	9	2	5	5	4	31 (4.2%)	58 (4.1%)	48 (3.9%)
TOTALS	110	122	96	125	140	142	735 (100.0%)	1409 (100.0%)	1230 (100.0%)
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	19

**Table 12**  
**AGE BY LIVING ARRANGEMENT<sup>8</sup>**

AGE BY LIVING ARRANGEMENT	LATTER SIX MONTHS - FISCAL YEAR 02				FY02 TOTAL % (N)	FY01 TOTAL % (N)
	% 16 Years and Under	% 17 Years	% 18 Years and Over	Total % (N)		
w/Parents	74.1	63.6	42.3	55.2 (399)	53.6 (739)	51.8 (624)
w/Guardian	5.9	3.3	2.4	3.5 (25)	4.1 (56)	3.9 (47)
w/Other relative	10.6	9.8	11.4	10.8 (78)	11.2 (154)	14.5 (175)
w/Partner	2.4	4.9	7.9	5.9 (42)	7.1 (98)	5.9 (71)
w/Spouse	0.0	1.1	2.4	1.5 (11)	1.7 (24)	2.4 (29)
Formal placement	2.9	6.0	1.6	3.0 (22)	2.4 (33)	2.2 (26)
Independently	0.0	2.7	16.8	9.3 (67)	9.4 (130)	9.3 (112)
Homeless	0.0	1.6	3.8	2.4 (17)	2.5 (34)	1.5 (18)
w/Partner (in partner's family's home)	3.5	4.3	4.9	4.4 (32)	4.0 (55)	4.8 (58)
Other	0.6	2.7	6.5	4.1 (30)	4.1 (57)	3.7 (45)
TOTALS (N)	100.0 (170)	100.0 (184)	100.0 (369)	100.0 (723)	100.0 (1380)	100.0 (1205)

<sup>8</sup> For the latter six months of fiscal year 2001-2002, there were thirteen individuals for whom age and/or living arrangement were unknown, bringing the YTD total of missing cases to thirty-six. NOTE: For FY 00-01, there were forty-four individuals for whom age and/or living arrangement were unknown.